

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**

### REMARKS

The §112 objection to claim 3 is addressed by the current amended form.. As to the objections to claims 6-8, 10 and 14, the bonding issues to the kinds of surfaces described in the present invention are known in sufficient manner due to references such as the charged attractions given in Curry et al. or the chemical bonding described in the newly identified prior art, Bonnett et al., where such processes such as dyeing, incorporation with a polymer melt or "a chemical entity bonded to a polymer" by one or several methods (page 7, lines 21-31) are described. The targeting issues are somewhat generally known to those skilled in the art at least with reference to Gram-positive bacteria (see e.g. US 6,416,785, present inventor among inventors there).

Contrary to examnier's comments Ultra Violet (UV) light is not an environmental condition of the present invention, because it has been explicitly excluded, in the previous reply within subclause (a) of claim 1 (amended) and now reinforced with a repeated exclusion within subclause (d) of claim 1 (currently amended). The arguments against Curry et al. continue and are reinforced as to this.

The Bonnett et al. publication put forth by the examiner does indeed touch more closely to the present invention. But as implied by the examiner's analysis and comments neither Bonnett et al. alone or in combination make obvious the invention at least as claimed in claims 6-8, 10 and 14. In particular Bonnett et al. teaches that the "polymer is preferably chosen to resist attack by singlet oxygen" (page 6 lines 31-2) which is in contrast to the present invention, where in a preferred embodiment the "linking mechanism is designed so that it can be cleaved when exposed to ....singlet oxygen." (specification, page 5 lines 19ff). Further as to claims 13, and 14 they specifically apply to a stack/sheath of layers/sheets, each having photosensitizer moieties to attack bacteria, wherein the layers are protected from premature activation by the construction and materials used in the preparation of the stack of photoactive layers/sheets. This type of product is not disclosed nor implied in the publication by Bonnett et al.

Appl. No. 09/931,265  
Amdt. dated October 17, 2003  
Reply to Office action of May 19, 2003

BJA262A

In light of these points and the changes made, the claims as currently amended thus are not made obvious by Bonnett et al, by Curry et al. nor by the combination of these two publications.

With these changes and remarks, it is believed that the disclosure is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. An early and favorable response is earnestly solicited. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: October 17, 2003

CeramOptec Industries, Inc.  
515 Shaker Road  
East Longmeadow, MA 01028  
Phone: (413) 525-8222

Bolesh J. Skutnik, PhD, JD  
Reg. No. 36,347  
Attorney for Applicants

Fax: (413) 525-0611